Dear Roger 11/27/83

Sylvia tells me you've been busy, as I supposed I should have assumed by your silence. I hope it is oroductive and that you are happy.

So, don't interrupt anything important to try to get the info about which I'M curious. But I'll explain.

It is atypical for publishers not to disclose info about authors, at least what is in Contemporary Authors. They have been refusing, not just failing, to say a word about Jean Davison, and her book makes this more provocative. It is deliberately dishonest, deliberately ubfactual about Oswald and his security clearances.

She taught in Georgia, which is where Alexis Davison, of Oswald notebook/ Penkovsky case fame. However, her husband is John, a zoologist, now apparently teaching at Univ. Vt., Burlington, where the phone is in her name, not his. Alexis' father Hal had another son, Peter, but no indication of any John. However, Hal could have had a brother, etc. And there is no apparent explanation for not disclosing any biographical data about an author, especially one plugged by thecombo of Normal Mailer, Dan Schorr and Tom Wicker.

Davison repeats that Oswald had only a low clearance. He in fact was crypto, which I am told requires also top secret, and on checking I find that all of his Marine assignments after Keesler were associated with the CIA. Those at bases with U-2s are onbious. But what his personnel records hide is the fact that in between he was part of two operations against Sukarno (Indonesia) and in between them spent six months at Cubi Point (not his one mention, Subic bay), which also was an important CIA base.

What is not less than astounding, given all he wrote and said and all the people quoted on what he said is that Oswald apparently never made any mention of any of this highly-classified work, always associated with the CIA. I recall no mention and only his squib about being at Aubic bay as any mention at all. Incredible that the Oswald of the official portrait would be this tight on security, would have no mention in some political comment about the effort to overthrow Sukarno, or about the CIA and its operations, even U-2, at all. Makes no sense except in a very limited sense that is obvious.

In going back over Marine testimony, even the less sophisticated ones, it is apparent that the Oswaldovitch, comrade stuff is limited and atypical. The reasonable descriptions, of quite a number, is of a serious man who did not bait officers, was quite responsible and trusted, especially during emergencies, was anti-Batista more than pro-Castro, did not take what the Russians said at face value, and really deal with what a 1966 anonymous source told me was "black box stuff." The actual descriptions of Marines with perrsonal knowledge includes only highly-classified work and that includes early warning, which was then quite secret.

In brief, these are my interests, and I'm curious about the appearance of this book for the 20th anniversary, with indications that it was delayed and rushed, and with all this steam behind it, with the provocative sidelights partly indicated here.

Excuse the haste. I'm oberdue on other things but wanted you to understand my interest but yet not to let anything important go to help.

required for responsibility and discrimination on this complicated subject and with these complicated people of complicated motive. So I do have an interest in not having all the work I've done, countless thousands of hours, ruined by a spectacular nothing. Nor do I want any pressures of this kind in the current litigation, which is progressing well without any help from CBS or any reporting by anyone. This, too, is an enormous and costly effort I believe it is not unreasonable to want to be left alone so it can work its way to as natural an end as the court and the power and the disposition to use that great power against me will permit.

In time, as you know, I will be making all of that available.

As you also know I have my own way of measuring CBS in this. I gave them much. They were too yellow to use it. It was solid, official evidence, not just my own opinion. I did give them copies. Naturally with this experience I have not provided any copies since. In time I will, not pieces but whatever I get in the end.

In this I am not suggesting suppressing anything. I am saying that it just is not possible to not intrude wrongly into the processes of justice with such an interview and I am saying that the interview itself will be without journalistic value or substance and will be a sideshow-freak approach regardless of intent.

I intend nothing personally with the following comment. I speak fact only. For all its wealth, power and influence CBS has been dishonest in its journalism on the political assassinations. It not only has turned fact around and refused to air what by any legitimate journalistic standard was news it has never, for example, asked me if I have anything newsworthy it can have. Often the answer might have been "yes." It might be now if something on which I'm working, the sale of a piece for fairly prompt appearance, comes to nothing. (Any ideas along that line?) It is something pretty definitive on JFK and never published. Very simple, too. Uncomplicated. I have a chain of possession on how I got it, as properly as one can get anything. No tricks. No leaks. Covering letters, checks in payment, etc. And some of the records are even handwritten. These are all copies of originals.

Ray has not fired me. He has not broken with Jim. He has to be in the hands of irresponsible and incompetent lawyers in his pending civil action. He has not been in touch with me on it but I do know his formulation. I'll have copies tomorrow. It is not good and it speaks very poorly for those who would file it. It is, in fact, incompetent, often irrelevant and in places from what was read to me unfactual. He is not only in a position that drives one to try anything, he also lacks first-hand knowledge and is, without the best of underinformed reporters having any way of knowing, what he has been told by the undependables, some with the poorest records for integrity.

I don't know if he'll ask my opinion or listen to it as he has in the past. But I strongly encourage you to abandon this because the best one can hope for out of it is more whoring around. It can't possibly be helpful, at this juncture, with what I cannot now tell you about but is very real, it can be exceedingly bad. Neither you nor Rather would want to engage in what can be as bad as even good intentions will leave this kind of interview. In time you'll know. It is very current. It involves courts.

My specific knowledge on the surveillance does not involve you but also is not complete. My source does not know you or of you and the files are quite extensive. I was not being paranoid. I have pretty much assumed this but not its extent. We have walked much together but you have never seen me look around. You know how free I am on the phone and in letters. However, there is surveillance not as an exercise but because it can yield information. Sources is one, knowledge is another, and then there are plans and other things. Litigation is not self-indulgence or meaningless. It is one way of accomplishing legitimate objectives with some promise of its being a dramatic way. My concern with this is not my past, which would have to be seriously misrepresented for it to defame me in any way. And my concern is with freedom. And why the hell all this extensive surveillance on one who writes non-fiction if the official story is true?

best,